

RECEIVED  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE

MAY 13 2014

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
MID. DIST. TENN.

ROBERT ZENAS WHIPPLE, III

Plaintiff,

v.

DERRICK SCHOFIELD, et al.

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:13-cv-00109

CHIEF JUDGE HAYNES

JURY DEMAND

*ORDER*

*Based upon the  
parties' statements in  
their recent, this  
motion is DENIED*

*amended.*

*Will file  
memo*

*6-5-14*

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER DOCKET ENTRY 184**

Plaintiff moves this honorable Court to reconsider *PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL* *DISCOVERY DUE TO FAILURE TO RESPOND* (Docket Entry No. 184). In that motion, the plaintiff sought an order compelling counsel for defendants Otis Campbell, Kevin Rea, and Tim Hansche to respond to his discovery requests. A court order was entered on April 17, 2014 (Docket Entry No. 185); it was written on Docket Entry No. 180 but the docket summary referenced Docket Entry No. 184. Plaintiff wrote to the clerk to verify which motion was denied, but received no response and is therefore uncertain if this motion has been ruled on.

As grounds to reconsider, Plaintiff contends that the discovery requests in question were completely ignored by defense counsel Gail Vaughn Ashworth. She did not object, respond, seek more time, or take action in any way regarding these discovery requests. In addition, she has missed two more discovery deadlines while this motion was pending:

1. *PLAINTIFF'S SEVENTH REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS* (due April 15)
2. *PLAINTIFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO DEFENDANT KEVIN REA* (due April 21)